

relief from colics; effective as a treatment of so-called flu and "breaks" in swine following simultaneous vaccination. Misbranding of the Poultry Cholera Tablets was alleged for the reason that certain statements on the label falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for cholera in poultry; and effective as a preventative and cure of poultry diseases. Misbranding of the B. I. S. Ointment was alleged for the reason that the statement "Germicidal and penetrating properties", borne on the jar label, was false and misleading, and by reason of the said statement the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since it represented that the article was germicidal and penetrating when used as an adjuvant in the treatment of demodectic mange; whereas it was not germicidal and penetrating when used as an adjuvant in the treatment of demodectic mange.

The information also charged that the B. I. S. Ointment was misbranded in violation of the Insecticide Act of 1910, reported in notice of judgment no. 1383, published under that act.

On April 15, 1935, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company and the court imposed fines on all charges. The fine assessed on the charges for violation of the Food and Drugs Act was \$150.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

24543. Misbranding of Dr. Brehm's Hartz Mountain Antiseptic Bird Wash. U. S. v. The Hartz Mountain Products Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. no. 33916. Sample no. 65979-A.)

This case was based on an interstate shipment of a drug preparation which was misbranded because of unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims appearing in the labeling.

On April 5, 1935, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Hartz Mountain Products Co., a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended, on or about October 6, 1933, from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey of a quantity of Dr. Brehm's Hartz Mountain Antiseptic Bird Wash which was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted of an aqueous solution of 8-oxyquinoline sulphate containing a trace of lavender oil.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements regarding its therapeutic and curative effects appearing on the package label, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for skin irritations and feather pulling.

The information also charged a violation of the Insecticide Act of 1910 reported in notice of judgment no. 1400, published under that act.

On April 12, 1935, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed fines on all charges, the fine on the count charging violation of the Food and Drugs Act being \$25.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

24544. Misbranding of Key-Rite General Disinfectant. U. S. v. Interstate Chemical Manufacturing Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. no. 33919. Sample nos. 67295-A, 69862-A.)

This case was based on an interstate shipment of a drug preparation the labeling of which contained unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims.

On February 5, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Interstate Chemical Manufacturing Co., Jersey City, N. J., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended, on or about January 16, 1934, from the State of New Jersey into the State of New York, of a quantity of Key-Rite General Disinfectant which was misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article consisted of soap, water, coal-tar neutral oils, and phenols.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding its therapeutic and curative effects, appearing on the can label, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective to aid in the prevention of certain poultry diseases, effective to eliminate many poultry diseases, effective as a preventive measure for tuberculosis and foot diseases in poultry, and effective as a treatment, remedy and cure for ordinary eczema, ordinary galls, sores, cuts, and wounds in horses and for cuts, ordinary ulcers

and wounds in dogs, effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for ordinary eczema in hogs and as a preventive measure for hog cholera in hogs.

The information also charged a violation of the Insecticide Act of 1910, reported in notice of judgment no. 1401, published under that act.

On February 15, 1935, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company and the court imposed a fine of \$50 which covered both violations.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

24545. Adulteration and misbranding of yellow beeswax. U. S. v. 200 Packages of Yellow Beeswax. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 34568. Sample no. 2629-B.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of beeswax which failed to conform to the requirements of the United States Pharmacopoeia.

On December 21, 1934, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 200 packages of yellow beeswax at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about January 2, 1934, by the E. A. Bromund Co., from New York, N. Y., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in the said pharmacopoeia, and its own standard was not stated on the label.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, "guaranteed under the Pure Food and Drugs Act, June 30th, 1906", appearing on the label, was misleading, since it created the impression that the article had been examined and approved by the Government, and that the Government guaranteed that it complied with the law; whereas it had not been so approved and was not so guaranteed by the Government.

On February 16, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

24546. Misbranding of Grainalfa. U. S. v. 6 Bottles, et al., of Grainalfa. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 34604. Sample no. 25970-B.)

This case involved a preparation, the labeling of which contained unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims. The labeling was further objectionable because of false and misleading claims regarding its constituents.

On December 26, 1934, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 52 bottles of Grainalfa at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce in various shipments on or about September 26, October 16, and November 1, 1934, by the Laboratory Products Co., from Providence, R. I., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of water, sugars, extracts from plant materials including methyl salicylate and peppermint oil.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the labeling were false and misleading under the provisions of the act applicable to food, and were false and fraudulent under the provisions of the act applicable to drugs: (Bottle label, all sizes) "Vitolectic Food * * * Recommended for replacing the Essential, Vital Food Elements which are so universally lacking in the denatured foods of modern civilization. Nourishes every organ and tissue of the body and aids all bodily functions. Suggestions for Using From $\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 teaspoonfuls 3 or 4 times daily, clear, or diluted with water, milk, or fruit juice. In case of fatigue or exhaustion use it any time."

On February 4, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

24547. Misbranding of Calafio Liquid. U. S. v. 34 Packages, et al., of Calafio Liquid. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. nos. 33104, 34549, 34678. Sample nos. 73661-A, 22484-B, 25963-B, 25964-B.)

These cases involved interstate shipments of a drug preparation known as Calafio Liquid. The article was labeled to indicate that the directions could